



DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

P.O. DRAWER Q
INDEPENDENCE, CA USA 93526
PHONE: (760) 878-0201
FAX: (760) 878-2001

COUNTY
OF
INYO

Doug Wilson, Interim Director
Jeff Ahlstrom, Interim Deputy Director Public Works

California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Financial Assistance Branch
Post Office Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236
Attn: Zaffar Eusuff

August 24, 2012

General Comments:

In several cases, one of which is Review and Scoring Criteria, Implementation Round 2 PSP page 25, the reader must flip between the guidelines and the PSP documents to “get the whole picture” Why don’t you simply put all the information regarding a topic or aspect of the process in one place? For instance Attachment 3 Work Plan, page 19; and Exhibit A Work Plan, page 31; could all be located within the same part of the document. To get all the information DWR presents to us, we have to continually flip from one page and section to another page and section in order to grasp all the information DWR presents for work Plans. There is no reason all the information relative to work plans can not be located within one place. This applies to all the Attachments and Exhibits.

Supporting documentation: If the supporting documentation is a map or report only available in hard copy, and it is included, then a scanned pdf appears to be the only means to include the document. Are there any other ways to electronically include the document?

Will a reference to a document *whether or not it is available on the web*, carry as much weight during the scoring as an electronic copy of the reference included with the application?

I see no mention of the need for a fiscal agent to act intermediate between DWR and an applicant, as was the case in Implementation Round 1. In fact, in several places of the Guidelines or the PSP it states clearly that the contract will be written between the applicant and DWR. Do we need a Fiscal Agent in Round 2?

Throughout the Benefits and Costs section, emphasis is placed upon physical benefits. What sorts of non-physical benefits could a project provide and still be eligible for funding?

If a project can help resolve local water related conflicts, must the evidence of that conflict be discussed in the Plan before the reviewers will recognize that and consider it in the scoring?

Draft Guidelines July 2012 comments

1. Pg. 25 G Review Process: What is “standard scoring criteria”? Conversely, where is standard scoring not applied and what is the non-standard scoring criteria?
2. Pg. 25 G Review Process : Please define “well presented documentation”.
3. Pg. 43 Table 3: Consider CWP Management Outcome “Improve Water Quality”. A corresponding RMS is Drinking Water Treatment and Distribution. Does this mean drinking water treatment *or* distribution? If I have any project dealing with the delivery of potable water i.e. transmission, distribution, metering, etc., is that an “Improve Water Quality” outcome? Conversely, for any water tank, transmission, distribution, valving, metering, fire hydrant project, what would be the corresponding CWP Management Outcomes?
4. Pg. 43 Table 3: Couldn’t water conservation projects be an RMS for “Practice Resource Stewardship”? How can conservation not be good drinking water resource stewardship?
5. Pg. 44 Documenting the Process: What does “What RMS were considered which must, at a minimum, include all of the RMS listed in Table 3” mean?
6. Pg. 58 Technical Analysis: Are you saying that project durations are to be twenty years?
7. Our computing capabilities may be preventing us from using the DAC mapping tool. Can 2000 data be used to determine DAC status?
8. Pg. 16 top of page: “DWR will make two exceptions to the eligibility criterion listed in Section III.B” Isn’t the intent to make exceptions for DAC’s to the list of elements on page 15?

Draft Implementation Round 2 PSP July 2012 comments

1. Pg. 8 C Eligible Project Types: “As described in the 2012 Guidelines, there are two exceptions to this eligibility criterion,...”. What criterion are you referring to, Section III.B or Section III.C of the Guidelines”? The above referenced parts of both page 16, Guidelines, and page 8, PSP Implementation Round 2 read as though the exception for DAC’s apply to the list of elements of Section III.C.
2. Pg. 21 Attachment 6: What is the difference between an output and an outcome? Are outputs the benefits the project delivers, while the project’s intended goal is the outcome?
3. Pg. 21 Attachment 6: Are measurement parameters simply units; like acre-feet, tons of greenhouse gasses, milligrams per liter, lineal feet of pipe, gallons of tank capacity?

4. Pg. 21 Attachment 7: “Scoring will be based solely on the technical justifications of project(s) with respect to the claimed physical benefits.” Don’t you mean that the 10 points available in the scoring criteria for Technical Justification are based solely on the technical justification of projects? As written, it implies Technical Justification is the only criterion used to allocate the 80 points possible when scoring projects.
5. Pg. 23 Figure 1: If a DWR method is chosen, and there are both monetized and non-monetized benefits for a specific project, would both a section D2 & Section D3 analysis for the same project be performed? If so, on Table 20 for a particular project on a row, there could be both column (d) and (h) entries, provided of course that benefits were not double counted?
6. Pg. 23 figure 1: What is the benefit for a DAC to use the cost Effectiveness Analysis rather than the others?
7. Pg. 23 Figure 1: If I have a DAC project with both physical and non-physical benefits like social benefits, should I skip the cost effectiveness analysis and use the Section D2 and D3 analysis, or do the Section D1 analysis and D2 analysis?
8. Pg. 23 Figure 1: Is the information or data used to perform the Section D1 analysis different than that used to perform the D2 analysis which is also different than that used to perform the D3 analysis, or, conversely, would the same information and data be used to perform any of the three analysis?
9. Pg. 28 Technical Justification for Project: How do I know if a technical analysis is appropriate for the size of a project? Based upon past reviews of Round 1 submissions, I need to provide detail over and above what I think would be necessary. How do I know when too much detail is too much?

Thank you for your kind attention to my comments and questions.

Sincerely,

Keith Pearce
(760) 878-0210 Office
(760) 937-2315 Cell